

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

)	
LANDMARK LEGAL FOUNDATION)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 12-1726 (RCL)
)	
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION)	
AGENCY,)	
)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

**DEFENDANT’S REPLY TO PLAINTIFF’S OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR AN
EXTENSION OF TIME**

Now comes the Defendant, EPA, in Reply to the Plaintiff’s Opposition to EPA’s request for an extension of time to file its Reply. Defendant seeks to clarify the record. Defendant received notice from the Plaintiff’s counsel that although Plaintiff would not consent to the EPA’s Motion for Extension of Time, it would not file a formal Opposition to the Motion. As a result, Defendant filed its motion for extension as unopposed.

Respectfully submitted,

RONALD C. MACHEN JR.
DC BAR #447-889
United States Attorney
For the District of Columbia

DANIEL F. VAN HORN,
D.C. BAR # 924092
Chief, Civil Division

/s/

By:

HEATHER D. GRAHAM-OLIVER

Assistant United States Attorney

Judiciary Center Building

555 4th St., N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20530

(202) 305-1334

heather.graham-oliver@usdoj.gov